

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page[illegible]


PTO/SB/21 (08-03)


Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>	Application Number	09/328,667	
	Filing Date	06/09/1999	
	First Named Inventor	Radhika R. Roy	
	Art Unit	2663	
	Examiner Name	Duc T. Duong	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	11	Attorney Docket Number	113394

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fee required to Deposit Account of Ronald D. Slusky, Attorney at Law, Account No. 502,186		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Law Office of Ronald D. Slusky
Signature	
Date	04/22/2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.	
Typed or printed name	Ronald D. Slusky
Signature	
Date	04/22/2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : 09/328,667
Inventor(s) : Radhika R. Roy
Filed : June 9, 1999
Art Unit : 2663
Examiner : Duc T. Duong
Docket No. : 113394
Title : System and Method for Gatekeeper-to-Gatekeeper
Communication

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON D.C. 20231


SIR:

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO REPLY

Applicant herewith petitions the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to extend the time for reply to the Office Action dated 01/12/2004 for one month from 04/12/2004 to 05/12/2004.

Please charge the deposit account of Ronald D. Slusky, Attorney, Deposit Account No. **502,186** in the amount of \$110.00 to cover the cost of the extension. Any deficiency of overpayment should be charged or credited to the above-identified deposit account.

Radhika R. Roy

By: 
Ronald D. Slusky
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,585
(732) 249-0900

Law Office of Ronald D. Slusky
P.O. Box 4378
Highland Park, New Jersey 08904-4378
Date: 04/22/2004

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

**IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

PATENT APPLICATION

Application No. : 09/328,667
Inventor(s) : Radhika R. Roy
Filed : June 9, 1999
Art Unit : 2663
Examiner : Duc T. Duong
Docket No. : 113394
Title : System and Method for Gatekeeper-to-Gatekeeper
Communication

**COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231**

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This is in response to the Final Office Action of 01/12/2004.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

Listing of Claims:

- Fig. 4
1. (Previously Presented) A method for communication employing a plurality of gatekeepers, the method comprising the steps of:
- receiving a request for information at a first gatekeeper;^{420b}
 - determining whether the information is known by the first gatekeeper;
 - sending the request via at least one intermediate gatekeeper to a second gatekeeper^{420c} if the information is not known by the first gatekeeper;^{420d-f}
 - receiving the requested information from the second gatekeeper via the at least one intermediate gatekeeper wherein a hierarchical level associated with said first gatekeeper is different from a hierarchical level associated with said intermediate gatekeeper; and
 - sending the requested information to a third gatekeeper^{420a} wherein the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are of a same hierarchical level and located in a same domain and wherein said request was received from said third gatekeeper.
2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:
- storing the received information in at least one of the first, intermediate and second gatekeepers.
3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein said sending the request includes the steps of:
- determining a next gatekeeper in a gatekeeper-level path to the requested information.
4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the information includes an application address.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the information includes resource information.

6. Canceled.

7. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 2, further comprising the step of:
attempting to connect to a called entity using information contained in the information.

8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 3, further comprising the step of:
determining whether a hop-count field has been set to zero; and
if the hop-count field has been set to zero, dropping the received information.

9. (Original) The method of claim 3, where the first gatekeeper is an inter-zone gatekeeper.

10. (Original) The method of claim 3, where the first gatekeeper is an inter-domain gatekeeper.

11. (Previously Presented) An apparatus for communication, the apparatus comprising:
a processor; and
a memory coupled to said processor, said memory storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor for performing the steps of:
receiving a request for information at a first gatekeeper;
determining whether the information is known by the first gatekeeper;
sending the request via an intermediate gatekeeper to a second gatekeeper if the information is not known by the first gatekeeper;

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

receiving the requested information from the second gatekeeper via the intermediate gatekeeper wherein a hierarchical level associated with said first gatekeeper is different from a hierarchical level associated with said intermediate gatekeeper; and

sending the requested information to a third gatekeeper wherein the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are of a same hierarchical level and located in a same domain and wherein said request was received from said third gatekeeper.

12. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the instructions further perform the step of:

storing the received information in at least one of the gatekeepers.

13. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 11, wherein sending the request includes the step of determining a next gatekeeper in the gatekeeper-level path to the requested information.

14. (Original) The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the information includes an application address.

15. (Original) The apparatus of claim 11, wherein the information includes resource information.

16. Canceled.

17. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 12, said memory storing further instructions adapted to be run on said processor, said further instructions comprising:

attempting to connect to a called entity using information contained in the information.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

18. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 13, said memory storing further instructions adapted to be run on said processor, said further instructions comprising:

determining whether a hop-count field has been set to zero; and
if the hop-count field has been set to zero, dropping the received information.

19. (Original) The apparatus of claim 13, where the first gatekeeper is an inter-zone gatekeeper.

20. (Original) The apparatus of claim 13, where the first gatekeeper is an inter-domain gatekeeper.

21. (Previously Presented) A medium for communications, the communication using a plurality of gatekeepers at different hierarchical levels, said medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor for performing the steps of:

receiving a request for information at a first gatekeeper;
determining whether the information is known by the first gatekeeper;
sending the request via an intermediate gatekeeper to a second gatekeeper if the information is not known by the first gatekeeper;
receiving the requested information from the second gatekeeper via the intermediate gatekeeper wherein the first gatekeeper and the intermediate gatekeeper are at different hierarchical levels; and
sending the requested information to a third gatekeeper wherein the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are of a same hierarchical level and located in a same domain and wherein the request was received from the third gatekeeper.

22. (Previously Presented) The medium of claim 21, wherein the instructions further perform the step of:

storing the received information in one of the gatekeepers.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

23. (Previously Presented) The medium of claim 21, wherein said sending the request includes the steps of:

determining a next gatekeeper in the gatekeeper-level path to the requested information.

24. (Original) The medium of claim 21, wherein the information includes an application address.

25. (Original) The medium of claim 21, wherein the information includes resource information.

26. Canceled.

27. (Previously Presented) The medium of claim 22, storing further information adapted to be executed by a processor, the further information comprising:

attempting to connect to a called entity using information contained in the information.

28. (Previously Presented) The medium of claim 23, storing further information adapted to be executed by a processor, the further information comprising:

determining whether a hop-count field has been set to zero; and

if the hop-count field has been set to zero, dropping the received information.

29. (Original) The medium of claim 23, where the first gatekeeper is an inter-zone gatekeeper.

30. (Original) The medium of claim 23, where the first gatekeeper is an inter-domain gatekeeper.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-25 and 27-30 remain pending in this application.

The final office action appears to have repeated verbatim the rejection set forth in the Office action of 07/24/2003.

That rejection had advanced the view that it would have been obvious to modify Galasso to put the US master gatekeeper and a zone gatekeeper at the same hierarchical level. (Office action of 07/24/2003 page 3, lines 8-12.) Applicant had responded to that office action in a "Response To Office Action" dated 10/17/2003 pointing out why that modification would not have been obvious.

The most recent, final Office action counters applicant's arguments by pointing to a statement in Galasso at col. 3, lines 52-53, indicating that in an embodiment of Galasso, "a master gatekeeper queries another master gatekeeper to resolve an address." (Final Office action, page 5.)

The rejection is again respectfully traversed, for at least two reasons.

Firstly, the Office action has not advanced any reason why applicant was incorrect in arguing that it would not have been obvious to put a master gatekeeper and a zone gatekeeper at the same hierarchical level. Thus applicant respectfully renews those arguments.

Secondly, it would appear that the Office action, in citing the passage at col. 3, lines 52-53 of Galasso, is advancing a different theory of how Galasso anticipates applicant's claims. In particular, as noted above, the original rejection was based on the theory that it would have been obvious to put the master gatekeeper and zone gatekeeper at the same hierarchical level, thereby allegedly anticipating the recitation in, for example, claim 1 that the "first" and "third" gatekeepers are at the same hierarchical level.

It now appears, however, that in citing col. 3, lines 52-53 of Galasso, the Office action is pointing to two master gatekeepers as corresponding to applicant's recited "first" and "third" gatekeepers.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

It is respectfully pointed out that the cited passage in Galasso stating that “a master gatekeeper queries another master gatekeeper to resolve an address” is clearly referring to the possibility that one master gatekeeper in one domain, such as US gatekeeper 550 in the US administrative domain (hereinafter “US domain”), can query another master gatekeeper in another domain, such as Europe gatekeeper 560 in the Europe administrative domain (hereinafter “Europe domain”). Applicant agrees with the examiner that Galasso’s US and Europe master gatekeepers are at the same hierarchical level. However, this fact in isolation does not mean that applicant’s claims can be said to read on Galasso.

In particular, applicant’s claims were rejected based on the theory that Galasso’s Europe gatekeeper 560 corresponds to applicants recited second gatekeeper, not to applicant’s recited third gatekeeper, as the Office action now seems to be implying. Thus if one of Galasso’s master gatekeepers 550 and 560 is going to be said to correspond to applicant’s recited “third” gatekeeper, then what in Galasso is going to correspond to the “second” gatekeeper?

It is also noted that applicant’s claims recite that the first and third gatekeepers are “in a same domain.” By contrast, the two master gatekeepers in Galasso are in different domains—namely the US domain and the Europe domain.

In order for Galasso to anticipate applicant’s claims, there would have to be some teaching in Galasso that would show, or render obvious, the provision of another master gatekeeper within (say) the US domain at the same hierarchical level, with that other master gatekeeper making queries of master gatekeeper 550 (as is the case, for example, with applicant’s gatekeepers 420a and 420b shown in FIG. 4). However, there is no such showing in Galasso. Nor is there any basis on which to assert that it would be obvious. ~~In particular, the mere fact that Galasso discloses two gatekeepers at the same hierarchical level~~ but in different domains that make requests of one another through an intermediate gatekeeper does not render obvious the inclusion of two gatekeepers at the same hierarchical level and within the same domain making requests of one another. Indeed, such an approach runs counter to the strictly hierarchical architecture that lies at the heart of Galasso’s disclosure.

Appl. No. 09/328,667

Attorney Docket No.: 113394

To repeat what is stated above, the passage at col. 3, lines 52-53 of Galasso is clearly referring to Galasso's two master gatekeepers 550 and 560, which are in different domains. Thus Galasso's two master gatekeepers cannot be said to correspond to applicant's recited first and third gatekeepers because the claims require the first and third gatekeepers to be in the same domain. Nor is there any basis to assert that it would be obvious, based on Galasso's teaching of a strictly hierarchical architecture, to provide two or more gatekeepers within a particular domain that query each other.

Moreover, any assertion based on col. 3, lines 52-53 of Galasso that the two master gatekeepers in Galasso correspond to applicant's recited first and third gatekeepers is inconsistent with the rejection itself because, as applicant understands the rejection, it is based on a reading that makes Galasso's master gatekeepers correspond to applicant's first and second gatekeepers, not applicant's first and third gatekeepers.

Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully,
Radhika R. Roy

By: 

Ronald D. Slusky
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,585
(732) 249-0900

Law Office of Ronald D. Slusky
P.O. Box 4378
Highland Park, New Jersey 08904-4378
Date: 04/22/04